

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 10, and 16 have been amended. No new matter has been amended. For example, the instant application serial no. 10/032,364 recites the following at lines 17-26 of page 10:

To select a function of the display or to go to a different web page, e.g., web page 551 of Figure 5B, a user tilts and rotates PTPED 100. This changes the angle of the projection, as controlled by display projection controller 610 of Figure 6A, and while the projected display is moved/repositioned, the dot remains in the same place. The user then aligns the dot with the function to be performed or to a web page link to which the user wishes to view...

112 Rejection

In paragraph 2, the Office Action asserts that Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In the interest of expediting prosecution of the instant application, Applicant has amended the independent Claims 1, 10 and 16 to recite "tilting and rotating." However, Applicant still maintains that "moving" is enabled by the instant application.

103 Rejections

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, and 15

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent publication no. 2003/0038928 by Alden (referred to hereinafter as "Alden") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,201,554 by Lands (referred to hereinafter as "Lands"). The Applicant has reviewed the cited references and respectfully submits that embodiments of the present invention are neither taught nor suggested by Alden or Lands, alone or in combination.

Amended independent Claim 1 recites,

A display projection system comprising:
an image generator for providing a beam, said beam comprising data to be displayed; and
an optical component to provide collimation of said beam, wherein said data is viewable via a projected display and said display projection system is

implementable in a portable electronic device, and wherein a function of said projected display to be performed is selectable by tilting and rotating said display projection system resulting in a change in an angle of said projected display to align a dot with a visual representation of said function so that sensors are not required to detect movement of said display projection system.

Applicant respectfully agrees with the Office Action's statement in paragraph 4 that "Alden failed to disclose that function of the projected display to be performed is selectable by tilting the display projection system." Further, Applicant respectfully asserts that Alden teaches away from "wherein a function of said projected display to be performed is selectable by tilting and rotating said display projection system resulting in a change in an angle of said projected display to align a dot with a visual representation of said function so that sensors are not required to detect movement of said display projection system," (emphasis added) as recited by Claim 1 and therefore Alden cannot be combined with Lands. For example, Alden states in paragraphs 0009 and 0010 of the summary section,

Further, the means of projection is integrated with a means to stabilize the image...while the user inadvertently jiggles the projector slightly, the image on the remote surface is stationary. Motion and proximity sensors are integrated into the handheld projector/cell phone which communicate through integrated logic with image stabilizers to stabilize the image's position and size on the remote surface (emphasis added).

Since, Alden requires the image to be stable and uses a stabilizing means to accomplish a stable image, Alden teaches away from "wherein a function of said projected display to be performed is selectable by tilting and rotating said display projection system resulting in a change in an angle of said projected display to align a dot with a visual representation of said function so that sensors are not required to detect movement of said display projection system," as recited by Claim 1.

For numerous other places that Alden teaches away from "wherein a function of said projected display to be performed is selectable by tilting and rotating said display

projection system resulting in a change in an angle of said projected display to align a dot with a visual representation of said function so that sensors are not required to detect movement of said display projection system” refer to lines 7-9 of the abstract, the last 3 lines of paragraph 0004, the last sentence of paragraph 0007, the 4th line of paragraph 0009, lines 31-32 of paragraph 0035, line 41 of paragraph 0035, line 48 of paragraph 0035, line 6 of paragraph 0036, line 12 of paragraph 0037, lines 7-8 of paragraph 0040, lines 2-3 of paragraph 0041, lines 3-9 of paragraph 0043, line 13 of paragraph 0043, line 20 of paragraph 0043, lines 23-24 of paragraph 0043, lines 5-9 of paragraph 0045, line 12 of paragraph 0045, the last sentence of paragraph 0047, lines 2-3 of paragraph 0048, lines 2-3 of paragraph 0049, the last two sentences of paragraph 0049, the last 3 sentences of paragraph 0050, line 13 of paragraph 0058, lines 38-48 of paragraph 0058, lines 5-6 of paragraph 0059, line 12 of paragraph 0060, line 9 of paragraph 0061, lines 3-4 of paragraph 0063, lines 2-3 of paragraph 0064, the last three sentences of paragraph 0064, lines 7-9 of paragraph 0066, line 13 of paragraph 0066, line 25 of paragraph 0066, line 5 of paragraph 0068, the last two sentences of paragraph 0070, lines 2-3 of paragraph 0072, and the last two sentences of paragraph 0072, among other places.

Lands fails to remedy the deficiency in Alden in that neither Alden nor Lands, alone or in combination, teach or suggest “wherein a function of said projected display to be performed is selectable by tilting and rotating said display projection system resulting in a change in an angle of said projected display to align a dot with a visual representation of said function so that sensors are not required to detect movement of said display projection system,” as recited by Claim 1. Since Claim 1 recites selecting “a function... by tilting and rotating said display projection system” which results in “a change in an angle of said projected display to align a dot with a visual representation of said function,” sensors “are not required to detect movement of said display

projection system.” In contrast, Lands requires sensors. For example in the abstract, among other places, Lands requires sensors to sense a change in tilt. No where does Lands teach anything other than sensors for sensing that his mechanism has tilted. For numerous other places that Lands teaches the requirement of sensors to detect that his mechanism has tilted refer to Col. 1 lines 47-48, Col. 1 line 55, Col. 1 line 64, Col. 2 line 2, Col. 2 line 8, Col. 2 line 23, Col. 2 line 38, Col. 2 line 54, Col. 3 lines 54-55, Col. 3 line 58, Col. 3 line 61, Col. 3 line 66, Col. 4 line 46, Col. 5 line 19, Col. 5 line 26, Col. 5 line 34, Col. 5 line 43, Col. 6 lines 13-15, Col. 6 line 53, and Col. 7 line 31, Col. 7 line 42. Of special importance, all of Lands’ highest level claims 1, 24, 31, 36, and 42 recite a sensor for detecting tilt. Further, Lands does not recite any other embodiment besides sensors for detecting tilt.

Therefore, Claim 1 should be patentable because neither Alden nor Lands, alone or in combination, teach or suggest “wherein a function of said projected display to be performed is selectable by tilting and rotating said display projection system resulting in a change in an angle of said projected display to align a dot with a visual representation of said function so that sensors are not required to detect movement of said display projection system,” as recited by Claim 1.

Independent Claim 10 is patentable for similar reasons that Claim 1 is patentable over Alden in view of Lands. Claims 2-9 depend on Claim 1 and Claims 11-15 depend on Claim 10 and include all of the limitations of the respective independent Claims 1 and 10. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the dependent Claims 2-9 and 11-15 are patentable for at least the reasons that the respective independent Claims are patentable.

Claims 16, 19, 21-23 and 25-27

In paragraph 16 of the Office Action, Claims 16, 19, 21-23 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alden in view of U.S. patent publication 2002/0175915 by Lichtfuss (referred to hereinafter as "Lichtfuss") and further in view of Lands. The Applicant has reviewed the cited references and respectfully submits that embodiments of the present invention are neither taught nor suggested by Alden, Lichtfuss, or Lands, alone or in combination.

As already stated, neither Alden nor Lands teach or suggest "wherein a function of said projected display to be performed is selectable by tilting and rotating said display projection system resulting in a change in an angle of said projected display to align a dot with a visual representation of said function so that sensors are not required to detect movement of said display projection system," as recited by Claim 16. Lichtfuss does not remedy the shortcomings in Alden and Lands because neither Alden, Lichtfuss, nor Lands teach or suggest "wherein a function of said projected display to be performed is selectable by tilting and rotating said display projection system resulting in a change in an angle of said projected display to align a dot with a visual representation of said function so that sensors are not required to detect movement of said display projection system," as recited by Claim 16. In fact, the Office Action does not even assert that Lichtfuss teaches or suggests "wherein a function of said projected display to be performed is selectable by tilting and rotating said display projection system resulting in a change in an angle of said projected display to align a dot with a visual representation of said function so that sensors are not required to detect movement of said display projection system," as recited by Claim 16.

Claims 17-27 depend on Claim 16 and include all of the limitations of independent Claim 16. In one example, Claim 27 recites "the shape and size of said

portable electronic device is penlike.” The Office Action states, “Alden in view of Lichtfuss does not disclose that the shape and size of the portable electronic device is pen-like. However, change in size or shape is a matter of design choice and such a ‘pen-like’ size and shape is functionally equivalent to the size and shape of the hand-held projector of Alden.” Applicant agrees that neither Alden nor Lichtfuss teach “the shape and size of said portable electronic device is penlike. Applicant respectfully disagrees that “the shape and size of said portable electronic device is penlike” is obvious in light of Alden and Lichtfuss. Alden and Lichtfuss disclose hand held devices that are approximately the size of a person’s palm. Inventiveness is required not only to realize that there is a need for a device that is “penlike” but to enable the implantation of a device by one of ordinary skill in the art that is “penlike.” Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 17-27 are patentable for at least the reasons that independent Claim 16 is patentable.

Conclusion

In light of the above-listed amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 1-27. The examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO

Date: 10/27, 2006



John P. Wagner Jr.
Registration No. 35,398

Address: Westridge Business Park
123 Westridge Drive
Watsonville, California 95076 USA

Telephone: (408) 938-9060 Voice
(408) 234-3749 Direct/Cell
(408) 763-2895 Facsimile